Page 9

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 4-9, and 12-28 are resubmitted. Claims 1, 8, 9, 17, 20-22, and 24-28 are amended. Claims 2, 3, 10 and 11 are canceled. No Claims have been added. Support for the amendments to the claims may be found in the originally filed specification, drawings and claims, especially at paragraph [0017] of the originally filed specification. No new matter is added.

The Examiner objected to claims 1, 8, 9, 17, 20 and 21 because of the use of the abbreviation 'APU'. The Examiner rejected claims 8, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Lampe et al. (US 5,097,659). The Examiner rejected claims 8, 21, 22, 25, 26 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Lampe et al. (US 5,031,398). The Examiner rejected claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lampe et al. (US 5,097,659). The Examiner rejected claims 23 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lampe et al. (US 5,097,659) in view of Seal et al. (US 5,822,838). The Examiner rejected claims 23 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lampe et al. (US 5,031,398) in view of Seal et al. (US 5,822,838). Finally, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lampe et al. (US 5,822,838).

Examiner's Interview

Applicants thank Examiner Rodriguez for taking the time on October 29, 2003 to conduct an Examiner's Interview. Amendments to the claims were discussed; however, no agreement was reached. More specifically, Applicants discussed adding the limitation of an air passageway connecting the source of pressurized air to the fuel tank for expelling fuel from the fuel tank. The

Page 10

Examiner indicated that it appeared the references of record did not teach or fairly suggest such a limitation.

Claim Objections

While not acquiescing to the merits of the Examiner's objection, Applicants have amended the claims to specifically recite the abbreviation of 'APU'. These claim amendments are supported by the specification at paragraph [0001], where the abbreviation APU is defined as Auxiliary Power Unit. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to claims 1, 8, 9, 17, 20 and 21 is requested.

Lampe et al., (U.S. Patent No. 5,097,569)

Lampe et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,097,659 ('659 Patent), teaches an airframe power unit for producing a power output comprising, *inter alia*, a pressure transducer (shown as item 60 in Figure 4). It appears that the invention of the '659 Patent necessarily relies on said pressure transducer to ensure proper pressure of the fuel flow from a primary valve (shown as item 52 in Figure 4) to a combustor (shown as item 16 in Figure 1). It appears that the invention of the '659 Patent further relies on a temperature sensor (shown as item 66 in Figure 1) to calculate a solution to produce an output signal which maintains the fuel flow in the primary fuel circuit through the primary fuel injector (shown as 58 in Figure 1) to produce stoichiometric combustion in the combustor.

By contrast, Applicant's invention provides an improvement over the prior art by providing a lean-burning APU start system that eliminates the need for such a pressure transducer or such a temperature sensor, as set out in the present application, page 7, lines 1-3. Moreover, currently amended claims 1,

Page 11

8, 9, 17, 20 and 21 of the present invention are distinguishable from the cited art due to the inclusion of a fuel tank having an expulsion device that is actuated by air from the air supply system via an air passageway. This feature is lacking in the cited art.

Lampe et al., (U.S. Patent No. 5,031,398)

Lampe et ai., U.S. Patent No. 5,031,398 ("398 Patent), teaches a control system for generating emergency hydraulic or electrical power comprising, *inter alia*, a temperature sensor (shown as item 28 in Figure 1). It appears that the invention of the "398 Patent necessarily relies on the temperature sensor to prevent overtemperature conditions from causing a mishap in a combustor (shown as 16 in Figure 1). Further, it appears that the invention of the "398 Patent also relies on a pressure sensor (shown as item 26 in Figure 1) that produces an output voltage in proportion to the pressure upstream from a venturi (shown as item 30 in Figure 1). The output voltage is received as input to a signal conditioning circuit (shown as item 52 in Figure 1) and ultimately used to calculate a control signal used to control a primary fuel valve (shown as item 38 in Figure 1), column 4, lines 14-62.

By contrast, Applicant's invention provides an improvement over the prior art by providing a lean-burning APU start system that eliminates the need for such a pressure transducer and such a temperature sensor, as set out in the present application, page 7, lines 1-3. Moreover, currently amended claims 1, 8, 9, 17, 20 and 21 of the present invention are distinguishable from the cited art due to the inclusion of a fuel tank having an expulsion device that is actuated by air from the air supply system via an air passageway. This feature is lacking in the cited art.

Page 12

For the above discussed reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims, as amended, are anticipated neither by the Lampe '398 patent nor by the Lampe '659 patent. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 8, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22 25, 26, 27 and 28 as being anticipated by either Lampe '398 or Lampe '659 is respectfully requested.

The combination of the Lampe '659 patent with the Lampe '398 patent does not overcome the deficiency in the patents taken separately, as discussed above. More specifically, Lampe '659 in view of Lampe '398 neither teaches nor fairly suggests a fuel tank having an expulsion device that is actuated by air from the air supply system via an air passageway. For this reason, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 18 as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Lampe '659 in view of Lampe '398.

Seal et al. (US 5,822,838)

The Seal patent describes high performance, thin metal lined composite overwrapped vessels. Particularly, Seal discloses a thin liner made of a metal having a high modulus of elasticity and a high ductility, high-performance composite overwrap and a high-performance film adhesive at the overwrap/liner interface.

By contrast, the present invention includes a high-pressure storage vessel having an aluminum-lined composite configuration (claim 23), filled with compressed air. Moreover, at discussed above, currently amended independent claims 1, 8, 9, 17, 20 and 21 of the present invention are distinguishable from the cited art due to the inclusion of a fuel tank having an expulsion device that is actuated by air from the air supply system via an air passageway. The Seal reference, taken alone or in combination with either

Page 13

Lampe '398 or Lampe '659, neither teaches nor fairly suggests such a structural configuration with an air passageway feeding the fuel tank with pressurized air.

For these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 15, 16, 23 and 24 are unobvious over either Lampe '659 or Lampe '398 in view of Seal '838. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is requested.

CONCLUSION

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the Office Action with respect to Claims 1, 4-9, and 12-28 are requested.

In the event the Examiner wishes to discuss any aspect of this response, please contact the attorney at the telephone number identified below.

Respectfully submitted,

By:

Michael A. Shimokaji

Attorney Registration No. 32,303

Honeywell International, Inc. Law Dept. AB2 P.O. Box 2245 Morristown, NJ 07962-9806 (602) 365-2588 Attn: Robert Desmond

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, y/A 22813-1450

Michael A. Shimokajl, Reg. No. 32,303